

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 59-109 are pending in the application, with claims 59, 78, and 93 being the independent claims. Claims 1-58 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 59-109 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Claim Objections***

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 9, 15, 17, 21, 28, 36, 40, 52, and 56 were objected to because they are "written in an outline format ((a), (b), or (1), (2), etc.), and should be written in sentence form." Furthermore, claims 10, 19, 24, and 25 were objected to "because they reference claims that are written in an outline format and should be written in sentence form." Applicant respectfully notes that the above listed objected claims have been canceled, but traverse these objections as if applied to new claims 59-77, and request that they be withdrawn.

Applicant has reviewed M.P.E.P. § 608.01(m) "Form of Claims" and C.F.R. § 1.75 "Claim(s)" to determine where a prohibition against writing claims in outline form is provided in the rules, but have failed to find any such prohibition. Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a cite to the rules in support of this objection so that Applicant has adequate opportunity and direction for correcting the form of the claims so that this objection may be overcome, if correction is actually necessary.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 9, 40, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has canceled claims 9, 40, and 50, and thus respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-8, 15, 16, 21, 28-40, 42-56, and 58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,852,810 to Sotiroff *et al.* (hereinafter Sotiroff). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and requests that it be withdrawn. Applicant notes that the above listed rejected claims have been canceled, but traverses the rejection with respect to new claims 59-109.

Technical differences exist between the claimed invention and Sotiroff. Sotiroff appears to allow users to search for housing, by selecting a point of interest on a map. For example, see FIG. 4, which shows a quadrant map. A user selects a point of interest 34 on the quadrant map. For a property at the selected point of interest 34 on the map,

further information is provided to the user. For example, FIG. 5 shows a picture and text related to the property.

Sotiroff is different from the presently claimed invention. Independent claim 59 recites “storing a plurality of postings, each posting including a source identification tag, an information body, and a broadcast descriptor, the broadcast descriptor identifying a geographical region of said each posting, wherein the geographical region is defined by a closed region on a map.” Sotiroff does not disclose postings that include the broadcast descriptor recited in claim 59 of the present invention. At most, Sotiroff appears to describe properties represented by points on the quadrant map. As recited in claim 59, the broadcast descriptor identifies “a geographical *region* . . . defined by a *closed region* on a map.” A “region” as recited in claim 59 is not a “point,” as in Sotiroff. Thus, Sotiroff does not teach postings including a broadcast descriptor identifying a geographical region of each posting, wherein the geographical region is defined by a closed region on a map, as recited in claim 59.

Claim 59 further recites “receiving a plurality of requests from mobile and stationary users, each request from a user including a user identification tag and an antenna descriptor, the antenna descriptor identifying a geographical location.” Sotiroff does not disclose an antenna descriptor identifying a geographical location. At most, Sotiroff describes a point of interest 34 selected on a map by a user to select a property, using a graphical user interface. The point of interest 34 of Sotiroff in no way identifies a geographical location received in a request from a user. Thus, Sotiroff does not teach an antenna descriptor identifying a geographical location, as recited in claim 59.

Claim 59 further recites “processing said each request, including: (1) identifying one or more postings having geographical regions that contain the geographical location, and (2) sending the identified one or more postings to the user.” Sotiroff does not teach this feature of claim 59. As described above, Sotiroff does not teach the postings of the present invention. Furthermore, Sotiroff does not teach sending postings. Still further, Sotiroff does not teach identifying postings having geographical regions that contain the geographical location. As described above, the point of interest 34 of Sotiroff in no way identifies a geographical location received in a request from a user. Thus, in no way can Sotiroff identify a posting having a geographical region that contains the geographical location. Therefore, Sotiroff does not teach “processing said each request, including: (1) identifying one or more postings having geographical regions that contain the geographical location, and (2) sending the identified one or more postings to the user,” as recited in claim 59.

Claim 59 further recites “processing a subsequent request from the user, the subsequent request including a user identification tag and an antenna descriptor specifying a subsequent geographical location.” As described above, the point of interest 34 of Sotiroff in no way identifies a geographical location received in a request from a user. Thus, Sotiroff does not teach an antenna descriptor, past or subsequent, identifying a geographical location, as recited in claim 59 of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 59 is patentable over Sotiroff for at least the reasons described above. Independent claims 78 and 93 are likewise patentable over Sotiroff for at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 60-77,

79-92, and 94-109, which depend from independent claims 59, 78, and 93, respectively, are patentable over Sotiroff for at least these reasons, and further in light of their own features. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In paragraph 51 of page 14 of the Office Action, claims 9-14, 17-20, 22-27, 41, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sotiroff in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,680 to Johnstone *et al.* (hereinafter Johnstone). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as if applied to new claims 59-109, and request that it be withdrawn.

As described above, claims 59-109 are patentable over Sotiroff for at least the reasons stated above. Applicants assert Johnstone does not remedy the deficiencies of Sotiroff. Thus, claims 59-109 are patentable over Sotiroff and Johnstone, alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. M. A. W.", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Jeffrey S. Weaver  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,608

Date: 12-16-05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

473688\_2.DOC